

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEITH JEROME WRIGHT,
Plaintiff,
v.
SANDOVAL,
Defendant.

Case No.: 1:22-cv-01082-JLT-CDB

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE IN WRITING
WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE
IMPOSED FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE
TO FILE AN OPPOSITION OR
STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DEEM
PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO REQUESTS
FOR ADMISSIONS ADMITTED**

21-DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Keith Jerome Wright is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds on Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claim against Defendant Sandoval.

I. BACKGROUND

The Court issued its Discovery and Scheduling Order on September 13, 2024. (Doc. 28.)

On May 7, 2025, Defendant filed a motion asking the Court to deem certain responses by Plaintiff to Defendant's request for admissions as admitted. (Doc. 31.)

Despite the passage of more than 21 days, Plaintiff has failed to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to Defendant's motion.

//

//

II. DISCUSSION

The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” *See* Local Rule 110. Pursuant to Local Rule 230(l), any opposition “to the granting of [a] motion shall be served and filed by the responding party not more than twenty-one (21) days after the date of service of the motion. A responding party who has no opposition to the granting of the motion shall serve and file a statement to that effect”

Because Defendant filed and served the pending motion on May 7, 2025, any opposition or statement of non-opposition by Plaintiff was due to be filed no later than May 28, 2025, plus time for mailing. Despite the passage of nearly 30 days, Plaintiff has failed to file either an opposition or statement of non-opposition to Defendant's motion.

III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Court **HEREBY ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause in writing, **within 21 days** of the date of service of this Order, why sanctions should not be imposed for his failure to comply with the Local Rules. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may comply with this order by filing an opposition or statement of non-opposition to Defendant's motion filed May 7, 2025.

Any failure by Plaintiff to respond to this Order may result in a recommendation
that this action be dismissed for a failure to obey court orders and a failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 6, 2025

Chris D. Brown
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE